



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

jll

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,559	03/07/2002	Yasushi Ochiai	4367-0101P	9100
2292	7590	12/07/2004		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
			EXAMINER SHEIKH, HUMERA N	
			ART UNIT 1615	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,559

Applicant(s)

OCHIAI ET AL.

Examiner

Humera N. Sheikh

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,9,10 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7,9,10 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*James M. Spear*  
JAMES M. SPEAR  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
AU 1615

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Status of the Application**

Receipt of the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR §1.114 filed 07/26/04, the request for extension of time (1 month-granted), the Amendment, Applicant's Arguments/Remarks and the Declaration under 37 CFR §1.1.32, all filed 06/24/04 is acknowledged.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 8 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

**Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierre et al. (US Pat. No. 5,300,318).**

Pierre *et al.* teach granulates of alimentary and/or medicinal active principles intended for feeding or treating ruminants are polished by spraying a solution of one or more active principles, resins and/or sugars onto the said active principles. The polished active principles are then coated with a polymer providing protection in the rumen (see Abstract). It is preferred to employ an aqueous solution of active principle and especially a solution sprayed onto a lysine and/or methionine granulate. The base granulate which is subjected to the polishing operation may be made from lysine hydrochloride crystals (col. 1, lines 55-61). The active principle is generally an amino acid such as methionine, lysine or one of its salts, phenylalanine, histidine, arginine, or tyrosine, a medicament such as a vitamin, antibiotic, or antiparasitic agent, or a protein. The preferred active principle is lysine, in which case a homogeneous granulate is obtained, consisting of a lysine core polished with a lysine film (col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 9). The granulate is screened so as to retain a granulate distribution between 200 and 4000  $\mu\text{m}$  (col. 2, lines 15-17).

According to Pierre *et al.*, the coating contains at least one component, which is chosen from basic polymers, copolymers or mixtures. The coating mixture solution is sprayed onto the polished granulate using a fluidized bed or any other spraying apparatus (col. 2, line 61 – col. 3, line 20). The granulate obtained after coating exhibits improved stability (col. 3, lines 30-34). Pierre *et al.* are silent regarding the granular strength.

It is the Examiner's position that no criticality has been established in the claimed granular strength range, since the prior art clearly teaches a similar process of granulation

Art Unit: 1615

whereby drug granules are sprayed with a solution of a water soluble drug on a crystal of said water soluble drug and a further coating with a release control film coating agent is applied to the drug granule. The art also teaches obtaining granules that exhibit improved stability over past formulations. No significant distinction is observed between the instant invention and the prior art, since the prior art initially teaches an effective method for the process of forming coated drug granules, whereby the granules provide for enhanced stability, as similarly desired by the Applicant. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would be fully capable of determining suitable and effective granular strength ranges through the use of routine or manipulative experimentation, to obtain the best possible results, as these are indeed variable parameters established within the art.

**Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama *et al.* (US Pat. No. 5,855,914).**

Koyama *et al.* teach granules and methods for producing granules having a core and having an increased granule strength, that are produced by spraying core granules with a dispersion of a low substituted hydroxypropylcellulose (L-HPC), and if necessary, simultaneously applying a dusting powder. The granules having a core thus obtained exhibit increased granule strength and improved disintegrating property. An active ingredient, such as drug can be contained in the dispersion, dusting powder or core granules (see Abstract).

The core granules include, for example, spherical granules, based on non-pareil seeds and the core granules in themselves may be a different active ingredient other than the active ingredient contained in the dispersion or dusting powder. The core granules may be coated with

Art Unit: 1615

waxes or polymers to produce the cores. The dispersion may additionally have the active ingredient and other additives other than the L-HPC uniformly dispersed and/or dissolved therein (col. 2, lines 30-45). The active ingredients in the form of granules are listed at column 2, lines 46 – col. 3, line 7 and include, for example, drugs for the central nervous system, respiratory organs, digestive organs, etc.

According to Koyama *et al.*, granulation is carried out, while nucleus granules are sprayed with a dispersion and/or solution of L-HPC and the active ingredient and/or additives, if necessary, and are applied with a dusting agent. The granules obtained have a core with uniform particle size (col. 3, line 57 – col. 3, line 4).

The granules are subjected to further coating to provide for flavor-masking coating, enteric coating, gastric coating or sustained-release coating, etc. and may be coated midway during the production for the purpose of stabilization, when the active ingredient is properly formulated. The granules may be filled into capsules or mixed with other components to produce tablets (col. 4, lines 5-13).

Coating agents include, for example, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose phthalate, hydroxypropylmethylcellulose acetate succinate, ethylcellulose, Tween 80 and the like (col. 4, lines 14-23). The granules having a core as obtained by these methods show increased granule strength and improved disintegration property (col. 4, lines 24-26).

The Examples at columns 4-8 demonstrate the production of uniformly coated granules having cores that were free from granule breakage during the coating process in each instance.

While Koyama *et al.* do not teach the instant granular strength (650-2500 gf/mm<sup>2</sup>), the Examiner points out that, generally differences in granular strength will not support the

Art Unit: 1615

patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such granular strength is critical. [W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In the instant case, the Applicant's have not demonstrated any criticality in the granular strength range. The prior art explicitly teaches processes for forming granules wherein active ingredients are sprayed onto granule cores and also teaches the further subsection of coating on the granules. Even further, the prior art clearly teaches stabilized granules that exhibit increased granular strength and teaches granule cores that are free from granule breakage during the coating process, which is a similar objective desired by Applicant. Therefore, the instant invention, when taken as a whole, is rendered *prima facie* obvious over the cited prior art of record.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 07/26/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Firstly, Applicant argued, "Pierre *et al.* (US '318) does not provide any suggestion regarding granular strength and/or tableting of coated granules. In contrast, the instant invention provides granules having sufficient strength, capable of maintaining a coating film during tableting processes. Claim 1 is also distinguished from Pierre *et al.*, since they use a Uniglatt apparatus (which is a non-rotary fluidized bed coating device)."

Art Unit: 1615

These arguments have been considered, but were not found persuasive. Pierre et al. teach a process of granulation whereby drug granules are sprayed with a solution of a water-soluble drug on a crystal of said water-soluble drug and a further coating with a release control film-coating agent is applied to the drug granule. The art also teaches obtaining granules that exhibit improved stability over past formulations, of which, Examiner notes, instant invention also desires improved stability. While, Pierre et al. are silent with respect to the particular granular strength, Applicant's have not demonstrated that the granules produced by Pierre et al.'s process would not have sufficient or ample strength to be suitable for further coating procedures. Pierre et al. teach a similar process, utilizing similar ingredients in the same field of endeavor and to resolve similar problems, as those desired by Applicant. Furthermore, one skilled in the art through routine or manipulative experimentation readily determines suitable granulation strengths, as these are entirely variable parameters. Regarding the particular 'rotary fluidized bed coating apparatus', no patentable distinction is observed through Applicant's use of the rotary apparatus since such coating apparatuses are routinely employed in the art to obtain suitable particles, granules and the likes thereof. Moreover, Pierre *et al.* teach at column 3, lines 18-20 that 'the coating mixture is sprayed using a fluidized bed *or any other spraying apparatus*'. Although Uniglatt is the preferred apparatus, the Examples of Pierre *et al.* are not limiting to the possible coating apparatuses that can be employed in the formulations of Pierre et al. Thus, Applicant's arguments were not persuasive.

Secondly, Applicant argued regarding the Ochiai Declaration which compares the instant granules having a homogeneous structure to that of the granules of Pierre *et al.* having a porous and non-homogeneous structure.



Art Unit: 1615

Applicant's arguments were carefully considered, but were not persuasive since the prior art teaches a process for producing granules whereby the non-uniformity of the granules are reduced (see column 2, lines 18-26). The art also recognizes granulates having improved stability over past formulations (col. 3, lines 30-34).

Lastly, Applicant argued, "Pierre do not teach unexpected results of a difference in resistance ability to acid solution, as is achieved with the present invention."

This argument was not deemed persuasive. Applicant's argument of 'unexpected results achieved by a difference in resistance ability to acid solution' is a limitation not recited in the claims nor interpreted into the claims. A method for producing granules is being claimed, of which the prior art teaches an effective method for producing coated drug granules. Moreover, it appears that the issue would be a difference of degree only, which is not seen as a patentable distinction. Examiner notes, that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In summary, there is no significant distinction observed between the instant invention and that of the cited art since the art clearly teaches processes for producing coated drug granules, comprising sprayed solutions of water-soluble drugs onto said drugs. Suitable coating techniques are also disclosed in the art to provide for stabilized coated drug granules. Thus, for the above-delineated reasons, the instant invention is rendered *prima facie* obvious and unpatentable over the cited art of record.

Art Unit: 1615

### Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Humera N. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-0604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00A.M. to 5:30P.M., alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman Page, can be reached on (571) 272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

H. N. Sheikh *H.N.S.*

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1615

December 02, 2004

*James M. Spear*

JAMES M. SPEAR  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*AU 1615*